

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1-6 and 12-15 were canceled by this amendment. Applicant has noted the claims to which each rejection still applies in the paragraphs below. Claims 16-21 have been added by this amendment.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5923,326) in view of Tilt (US Patent No. 5,363,481). Claims 1-6 and 12-15 having been canceled, this rejection is addressed with regard to claims 7, 9 and 11.

Bittinger discloses a secondary window that is docked with a primary window where the secondary window relates to a secondary application that is used to enhance the first application. See col. 6, lines 8-20. As stated in the office action, there is no timeout timer in Bittinger. The combination includes Tilt which discloses a timer that is reset as long as there is user input, and closes the GUI if there is none prior to expiration of the timer. See Tilt, col. 2, lines 24-32.

As amended, claim 7 requires that the primary application perform a first task, with examples given in the specification as printing, e-mailing a file, faxing, and file operations. The secondary application is to perform a second task, indicated by the user input. There is nothing in Bittinger about the second application performing a task related to the user input in the primary application window. Further, the timer in Tilt teaches that as long as there is user input, the timer is reset and continues to count, while claim 7 requires that the timer be stopped upon reception of a user input. This is supported in the Applicant's specification on page 5, where the timer either counts down or a user input is received. The combination of references does not teach a secondary user interface that has a timeout timer that expires and a second task is performed, or that is stopped upon a user input. It is therefore submitted that

claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 9 depends from claim 7 and requires that the timer be hidden. As discussed above, the combination of references does not teach a time that either expires or is stopped, much less that the timer is hidden. It is therefore submitted that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger et al. in view of Tilt, and further in view of Stucka et al. (US Patent No. 5,596,702). Both of these claims have been canceled.

Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger et al. in view of Tilt, and further in view of Frank et al. (US Patent No. 5,651,107). Both of these claims have been canceled.

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger et al. in view of Tilt, and further in view of Blades et al. (US Patent No. 5,465,358). Claim 5 has been canceled, so this rejection is addressed with regard to claim 10.

Claim 10 depends from claim 7 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger et al. in view of Tilt, and further in view of McCoy (US Patent No. 6,526,575).

As discussed above, the combination of Bittinger and Tilt do not teach the invention as claimed in claim 7, from which claim 8 depends. The addition of McCoy to the combination does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination discussed above. It is

therefore submitted that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 16-21 have been added by this amendment. Claim 16 requires "receiving a user input from a primary application interface, the user input indicating a task to be performed by a secondary application, wherein the task is one of printing, faxing, e-mailing a file, and file operations," which is not shown, taught or suggested by the prior art. Claims 17-21 depend from claim 16. It is therefore submitted that claims 16-21 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 46404

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed
Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, PC
210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613